

1 KEVIN V. RYAN (CSBN 118321)  
United States Attorney

2 MARK L. KROTOSKI (CSBN 138549)  
3 Chief, Criminal Division

4 JULIE A. ARBUCKLE (CSBN 193425)  
Assistant United States Attorney

5 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055  
6 San Francisco, California 94102  
7 Telephone: (415) 436-7102  
Facsimile: (415) 436-7234

8 Attorneys for the United States of America

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
11 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

12 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )

13 Plaintiff, )

14 v. )

15 VERNON WHITE, )

16 Defendant. )  
17

No. 3 07 70011 JL

18 STIPULATION AND ~~[PROPOSED]~~  
19 ORDER EXCLUDING TIME

20 On February 6, 2007, the parties in this case appeared before the Court and stipulated that  
21 time should be excluded from the calculations under the Speedy Trial Act, Federal Rule of  
22 Criminal Procedure 5.1, and 18 U.S.C. §3142(f)(2)(B) from February 6, 2007 to February 20,  
23 2007 for effective preparation of counsel, in that defense counsel required additional time to  
24 obtain and review information relevant to the government's motion for detention of defendant.  
25 The parties represented that there is good cause for granting the continuance, and that it was the  
26 reasonable time necessary for effective preparation of defense counsel, taking into account the  
27 exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The parties also agreed that the  
28 ends of justice served by granting such a continuance outweighed the best interests of the public

**FILED**

FEB 09 2007

RICHARD W. WIEKING  
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

1 and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

2 SO STIPULATED:

3  
4 KEVIN V. RYAN  
5 United States Attorney

6 DATED: February 6, 2007

7 /s/  
8 JULIE A. ARBUCKLE  
9 Assistant United States Attorney

10 DATED: February 7, 2007

11 /s/  
12 STEVEN KALAR  
13 Attorney for Defendant Vernon White

14 As the Court found on February 6, 2007, and for the reasons stated above, the Court finds  
15 that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the  
16 defendant in a speedy trial and that time should be excluded from the calculations under the  
17 Speedy Trial Act, Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 5.1, and 18 U.S.C. §3142(f)(2)(B) from  
18 Febraury 6, 2007 to February 20, 2007 for good cause and the effective preparation of defense  
19 counsel. See 18 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(8)(A). The failure to grant the requested continuance would  
20 deny counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise  
21 of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

22 SO ORDERED.

23 DATED: 2-9-07

24 Maria-Elena James  
25 United States Magistrate Judge  
26  
27  
28